

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
2 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065
rvannest@kvn.com
3 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - #184325
canderson@kvn.com
4 MICHAEL S. KWUN - #198945
mkwun@kvn.com
5 633 Battery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
6 Tel: 415.391.5400
Fax: 415.397.7188

KING & SPALDING LLP
DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279
fzimmer@kslaw.com
CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323
csabnis@kslaw.com
101 Second St., Suite 2300
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415.318.1200
Fax: 415.318.1300

8 KING & SPALDING LLP
9 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER
(Pro Hac Vice)
sweingaertner@kslaw.com
10 ROBERT F. PERRY
rperry@kslaw.com
11 BRUCE W. BABER (Pro Hac Vice)
1185 Avenue of the Americas
12 New York, NY 10036
Tel: 212.556.2100
13 Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819
ballon@gtlaw.com
HEATHER MEEKER - #172148
meekerh@gtlaw.com
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
1900 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Tel: 650.328.8500
Fax: 650.328.8508

14 Attorneys for Defendant
15 GOOGLE INC.

16
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
19 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

20 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 GOOGLE INC.,

24 Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-CV-03561-WHA

**GOOGLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL
COPYRIGHT LIABILITY TRIAL BRIEF
PURSUANT TO MARCH 26, 2012 ORDER**

Judge: Hon. William Alsup

1 The Court has asked Google to address Oracle's contentions regarding an alleged field-
 2 of-use restriction and its purported applicability to the Apache Harmony project. As explained
 3 below, the Apache Software Foundation ("Apache") licenses Apache Harmony to the public
 4 without *any* field-of-use restrictions, and rejected Sun's attempt to impose such a limit on the use
 5 of Apache Harmony. Notwithstanding these facts, Sun has never sued Apache, and has never
 6 asserted that the use of the Apache Harmony libraries is conditioned on a field-of-use limitation.
 7 To the contrary, Jonathan Schwartz, Sun's CEO at the relevant times, has testified that Apache
 8 Harmony can be used for any purpose so long as the resulting product is not called "Java."
 9 There is no field-of-use restriction on the use of Apache Harmony. Oracle's field-of-use
 10 restriction argument is a red herring.

11 **I. The Apache Harmony project was launched in August 2005, and licensed without**
 12 **any field-of-use restrictions.**

13 In August 2005, Apache announced the Apache Harmony project, the goal of which was
 14 to create an open-source product compatible with J2SE. This project followed open-source
 15 efforts by other groups to achieve the same goal, such as GNU Classpath from the Free Software
 16 Foundation. Apache licenses Apache Harmony to the public for free under version 2 of the open
 17 source Apache License. This license does not have any field-of-use restrictions.¹

18 **II. Apache never agreed to a field-of-use restriction, and Sun never objected to the use**
 19 **by Apache and others of the Java language APIs.**

20 Jonathan Schwartz, Sun's CEO from 2006 to 2010, testified that, absent a desire by
 21 Apache to call its Apache Harmony product "Java," Apache was free to offer its implementation
 22 of the Java language APIs for free, and others were free to use those implementations:

23 Q. Were you generally familiar with how the Apache Harmony product
 24 worked?

25 A. Yes.

26 ...

27 Q. And based on your understanding, as long as users did not call their

28 ¹ See Apache License, Version 2.0, available at <http://www.apache.org/licenses/LICENSE-2.0.html>. Version 2.0 of the General Public License, the open source license that governs use of GNU Classpath, similarly has no field-of-use restriction. See General Public License, Version 2.0, available at <http://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-2.0.html>.

1 products Java, they were free to use the source code that Apache Harmony made
2 available?

3 A. Yes.

4 Schwartz Depo. at 49:11-50:10; *see also id* at 47:17-23 (“It’s a free world. . . . If they called it
5 Java, we would be involved. If they didn’t call it Java, then they could call it a Linux phone,
6 they could call it a free phone or an open phone, that’s up to them.”). However, “In order to call
7 your product Java, and in order to feature to the marketplace that you were a Java phone or a
8 Java device and to get that brand, you needed to pass that the—the TCKs, the Testing [sic]
9 Compatibility Kits.” *Id.* at 46:17-21.

10 Starting in August 2006, Apache attempted to obtain from Sun a license to the J2SE 5.0
11 technology compatibility kit (“TCK”). The license *to the TCK* (i.e. to the suite of compatibility
12 tests) that Sun offered to Apache would have limited the use of Apache Harmony to certain
13 fields of use. Apache, however, never agreed to such a limitation.

14 In May 2007, with no TCK license in place for Apache Harmony, Schwartz publicly
15 stated, “there is no reason that Apache cannot ship Harmony today.” Trial Ex. 2341; Schwartz
16 Depo. at 51:15-22. According to Schwartz, however, Apache “wanted, in fact, to be able to call
17 Harmony Java. And we held firm and said no, that’s our core value. If you want to call it Java,
18 you can pay, you know, the fee to go run the test and compatibility kits, and that enable you to
19 tell your customers that you actually had a licensed Java runtime. But absent that statement,
20 they, you know, couldn’t say that, and they were frustrated by it.” Schwartz Depo. at 52:16-23.

21 In June 2007, Apache wrote an open letter to Sun, requesting a TCK license without a
22 field-of-use restriction. That same month, in an effort spearheaded by Oracle Corporation,
23 twelve signatories, including a Google Engineering VP, urged Schwartz to grant Apache an
24 unencumbered TCK license. *See* Trial Ex. 2347. Sun, however, refused. Because Apache was
25 unwilling to agree any field-of-use restriction, it *did not license* the TCK. As a result, Apache
26 *did not agree to—and never has agreed to—a field-of-use limitation for Apache Harmony.*

27 The lack of a TCK license, however, did not prevent others from using Apache Harmony:

28 Q. Now I take it they could already use the Apache Harmony code for free;
correct?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And they could put that in a commercial product and sell it?

3 A. Yes.

4 ...

5 Q. The one thing they couldn't do was call it Sun [sic]?

6 A. They could not call it Java.

7 Schwartz Depo. at 83:15-84:7. Even without a TCK license, "[a]nybody else who wanted to go
8 create their own runtime, whether it was Apache Harmony or GNU Classpath, was free to do so;
9 they just couldn't call it Java." *Id.* at 182:2-5. Mr. Schwartz will testify that commercial
10 products from IBM and Hewlett-Packard used the Apache Harmony implementation of the Java
11 language APIs without objection from Sun.

12 **III. There is no field-of-use restriction for Apache Harmony.**

13 The dispute between Apache and Sun was about branding, and the ability to say that
14 Apache Harmony is Java compatible. The end result was that Apache *did not agree* to a field-of-
15 use restriction. Notwithstanding Apache's refusal to limit the field of use for Apache Harmony,
16 Sun never sued Apache. In fact, Sun's CEO has testified that *anyone* can use the Apache
17 Harmony code (and thus its implementation of the Java language API specifications)—so long as
18 it does not call its product "Java."

19 Finally, Google in any event does not call Android "Java." Google has used the term
20 "Java" in its nominative, non-brand sense to describe, for example, how developers can use the
21 free and open Java programming language to write applications for the Android platform. That,
22 however, is not an attempt to brand the Android product "Java." Indeed, Oracle's complaint
23 does not include a trademark infringement count. Oracle's field-of-use restriction argument is
24 irrelevant and should be rejected.

25 Dated: March 27, 2012

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

26 By: /s/ Robert A. Van Nest
27 ROBERT A. VAN NEST

28 Attorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE INC.